


Docket No.: 246443US-2 CONT

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

GREGORY J. MAIER  
(703) 413-3000  
GMAIER@OBLON.COM

SURINDER SACHAR  
(703) 413-3000  
SSACHAR@OBLON.COM

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/734,248  
Applicants: Yukio TANIGUCHI, et al.  
Filing Date: December 15, 2003  
For: CRYSTALLIZATION APPARATUS,  
CRYSTALLIZATION METHOD, AND PHASE SHIFT  
MASK  
Group Art Unit: 1756  
Examiner: ROSASCO, S.

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Our check in the amount of \$0.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier  
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

**22850**

(703) 413-3000 (phone)  
(703) 413-2220 (fax)

Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423



DOCKET NO: 246443US-2 CONT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF: :  
Yukio TANIGUCHI ET AL. : EXAMINER: ROSASCO, S.  
SERIAL NO.: 10/734,248 :  
FILED: DECEMBER 15, 2003 : GROUP ART UNIT: 1756  
FOR: CRYSTALLIZATION APPARATUS,  
CRYSTALLIZATION METHOD, AND  
PHASE SHIFT MASK

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Restriction requirement of January 18, 2006, Applicants elect, with traverse, the invention of Group I, Claims 1-15.

Applicants traverse the outstanding Restriction requirement on the grounds that it has not been established that it be an undue burden to examine each of the noted inventions and claims together.

Under M.P.E.P. § 803, a Restriction is not proper if a search and examination can be made without a serious burden on the Examiner, and the outstanding Restriction requirement has not established that examining each of the currently-pending claims together would result in an undue burden.


M.P.E.P. § 803 specifically states:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.

The outstanding Restriction requirement has not established that each of the claims could be examined without an undue burden, and thus each of the noted inventions and claims should be examined on their merits.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier  
Registration No. 25,599  
Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423  
Attorneys of Record

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)  
GJM/SNS/des

I:\ATTY\SNS\24's\246443\246443US.REST.RESP..DOC